

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 22- 24 remain before the Examiner for reconsideration. Claim 21 has been cancelled. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended. No new matter has been added, and support for the amendments is found in the specification as originally filed.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102(b)

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Reilly et al. This rejection should be withdrawn in view of the remarks made herein.

Claim 14 is directed to a syringe and has been amended to include “at least one attachment member disposed on the rearward end of the body; and at least one rotation member comprising a recess formed in the rearward end of the body for releasably retaining a corresponding member of the syringe retaining mechanism of the injector.”

The Office Action alleges that Reilly teaches an attachment member 126 at the frontward end of the body, and a rotation member comprising a recess 120 formed in the body and for retaining a corresponding mechanism of the injector

Reilly does not disclose these novel features of Applicants' invention. The syringe 116 of Reilly includes a front end 120 that is tapered and connected to a neck. A disk shaped drip flange 126 is disposed on the neck (Col. 5, lines 54-57). Thus, in Reilly the drip flange 126 is disposed on the front end, and there is no disclosure of any structure (for example a rotation member) that includes a recess on the rearward end of the body. Accordingly, Reilly does not disclose Applicants' invention of Claim 14. Reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection is requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103

Claims 1-11 and 21-24 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Reilly in view of Dragon. The rejection should be withdrawn in view of the remarks made herein.

Claim 1 is directed to a syringe and has been amended to include, “at least one

encoding ring disposed on at least on a portion of the body and operable to provide syringe information to the injector.”

The Office Action alleges that Reilly teaches an attachment member 126 and a rotation member comprising a recess 120 formed in the body, and that the attachment member is an annular risge 126 which is also a proejction or tab member in Fig. 10. Further, the Office Action alleges that regarding claims 10 and 11, the attachment member could be moved in either an axial or vertical direction.

However, Reilly does not teach or suggest Applicants’ invention. Reilly is directed to:

[a] fluid injector indicated generally at 110 includes a pressure jacket 112 with a plurality of locking fingers 114 for engaging a syringe 116, shown in an open position in FIG. 10 and a closed position in FIG. 11. Pressure jacket 112 is connected at its rear end 132 to injector head 20 by any suitable means, such as a threaded connection (not shown). Syringe 116 has a cylindrical body 118 having a front end 120 and an open rear end 122. The front end 120 of syringe 116 is tapered and connected to a neck 124. A disk shaped drip flange 126 is formed around the neck 124. (Col. 5, lines 48-57, *Emphasis Added*)

Thus, the drip flange 126 is not an attachment member because structurally it does not provide any attachment between the body and the pressure jacket 112 that retains the syringe. Further, drip flange 126 is not releasably retained by the syringe retaining mechanism, rather drip flange 126 remains outside of the syringe jacket 126. In fact, in Reilly the “ front end 142 of the locking ring 140 is a distal annulus extending radially inwardly to form an open orifice 144 which permits the syringe body 118 to be inserted into pressure jacket 112, but does not permit the drip flange 126 to be inserted into pressure jacket 112. FIG. 10 shows that the front interior surface of the front end 142 is sloped to engage locking fingers 114 when in a closed position, as shown in FIG. 11 and more fully described below.” (Col. 5, lines 11-19, *Emphasis Added*.)

The Offcie Action also alleges that Dragon teaches a syringe body that is color-coded, and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the known technique of color-coding a syringe with the device of Reilly in order to provide an indication of syringe releated information.

However, this is not a teaching or suggest of Applicants’ invnetion of at least one

encoding ring formed in at least on a portion of the body and operable to provide syringe information to the injector. A color coding is not a ring that is formed in the body. Therefore, Dragon fails to remedy the deficiencies of Reilly. Reconsideration of Claim 1 is requested.

Regarding Claim 3, Reilly does not teach or suggest Claim 3 because attachment member 126 is not a projection that is adapted to engage corresponding members of the syringe retaining mechanism to enable release of the syringe from the injector through rotational movement. (see Col. 6, lines 20-37),

Regarding Claim 2, Reilly does not teach or suggest that the at least one attachment member comprises an annular ridge disposed on the body. Rather the attachment member is forward of the front end 120 of the syringe which is connected to a neck 124. And, the drip flange 126 is formed around the neck 124 (Col. 5, lines 54-57)

Regarding Claim 4, Reilly does not teach or suggest the at least one attachment member that comprises one or more tab members because the drip flange 126 is one continuous disk shaped flange that is formed around the neck.

Regarding Claim 5, Reilly does not teach or suggest the tab members that comprise a first tab end attached to the body and a second tab end adapted to engage the syringe retaining mechanism of the injector. Rather, as discussed above drip flange 126 is connected and formed around the neck and does not attach to any part of the syringe retaining mechanism.

Regarding Claim 6, Reilly does not teach or suggest tab members that are resilient members. In fact, Reilly teaches a drip flange 126 that is fixed around the neck 124.

Further, Claim 2-11 and 22-24 depend from Claim 1, which as discussed is believed to be allowable. Accordingly, Claims 2-11 and 22-24 are also believed to be allowable. Reconsideration of the rejections of Claims 2-11 and 22-24 is requested.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of the claims, indicate the allowability of the claims and arrange for an official Notice of Allowance to be issued in due course.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 26, 2008

/Jill Denesvich/
Jill Denesvich
Reg. No. 52,810

Medrad, Inc.
One Medrad Drive
Indianola, PA 15051
Telephone: (412) 767-2400